



05/20/04

Jlu B

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Inventors: Darin P. Smedberg  
Assignee: Calix Networks, Inc.  
Title: Angled Connector  
Serial No.: 10/051,940 Filing Date: Jan. 16, 2002  
Examiner: Hammond Group Art Unit: 2833  
Docket No.: CLX026 US Confirmation No.: 1747

Santa Clara, California  
May 18, 2004

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Notice of Allowability dated April 20, 2004, which included an Examiner's Amendment.

While a record of the substance of an interview conducted on April 5, 2004 has been made in writing in the Examiner's Amendment, this paper is submitted in excess of caution, to supplement the Examiner's record.

In the telephone interview conducted on April 5, 2004, in addition to the undersigned and Examiner Hammond, also present was the inventor, Mr. Smedberg.

Claim 9 was the only claim that was discussed during this interview. The Examiner indicated that the language of Claim 9 could be revised to clarify the invention being claimed. The undersigned asked if there was any prior art that the Examiner was aware of that would require the amendment of Claim 9. The

SILICON VALLEY  
PATENT GROUP LLP  
2350 Mission College Blvd.  
Suite 360  
Santa Clara, CA 95054  
(408) 982-8200  
FAX (408) 982-8210

Examiner indicated that the Examiner was planning to conduct a search. The undersigned stated that in the absence of prior art, there was no need to narrow Claim 9.

The Examiner indicated that a relationship between the "rotating" limitation of Claim 9 and the "unplugging" limitation of Claim 9 could be more clearly recited in the claim. In response, the undersigned proposed the language listed in the Examiner's Amendment, in the middle of Page 2 of the Notice of Allowability. In making the proposal, the undersigned requested that the proposed amendment to Claim 9 be made directly by the Examiner, to avoid a further round of prosecution. The Examiner indicated that the patentability of Claim 9 was to be decided after conducting the prior art search.

In view of the absence of a prior art rejection of Claim 9 during the interview, no reasons were presented at the interview, as warranting favorable action. See 37 C.F.R. §1.133(c). Regardless, the substance of the interview is now believed to be of record.

If there are any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 982-8200, ext. 3.

**Express Mail Label No.  
EV 448 867 135 US**

Respectfully submitted,



Omkar K. Suryadevara  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 36,320